they resemble those of *albopictus*. It should be noted that Barraud's figures of *flavopictus* (Fauna of British India 5 (Culicidae): 236. 1934) do not coincide with those of Yamada.

The species is named for Maj. W. G. Downs, MC, AUS, acting island epidemiologist on Okinawa, in appreciation of his contribution of specimens and other services.

ENTOMOLOGY.—*The genera of beetles of the family Bruchidae in America north of Mexico.*[1]

J. C. Bridwell. (Communicated by W. L. Schmitt.)

The first species of Bruchidae from our area was described in the printed inaugural dissertation, or graduation thesis, of Michael A. Baeckner presented to the faculty of Upsala under the presidency of Linnaeus and defended on December 18, 1752. In this dissertation, *Noxa insectorum*, the pea Bruchus and the oriental species now known as *Callosobruchus chinensis* were described in the new genus *Bruchus*, there used for the first time as a generic name in zoology. They are the first species of Bruchidae described.

Names prior to 1758 are not available, and it is our great misfortune that, in his tenth edition, Linnaeus did not adopt the name *Bruchus* as he later did but treated the pea weevil in his genus *Dermestes*, and that his citation of the name *Bruchus americae septentrionalis* as published by Peter Kalm, 1756, has been ruled as offering no availability of the name *Bruchus*. In Opinion 5 of the International Commission of Zoological Nomenclature names prior to 1758 which are cited in synonymy in 1758 or later are not thereby made available for use. The writer hopes that an arbitrary ruling by the Commission may make an exception in this particular case so as to avoid the great confusion resulting from long use of the homonym *Mylabris* Fabricius, 1775, for the very large group of blister beetles and the relatively recent readoption of *Mylabris* Geoffroy, 1762, for the seed weevils. Such a ruling offers the only solution to the problems arising from the same generic name having been extensively used for more than a thousand species nearly equally applied to small weevils and to large blister beetles, but the problems are even more involved. Unless *Bruchus* can be validated as of 1758, this same name as applied by Geoffroy, 1762, is to be adopted for the genus we have known under the subsequent name *Ptinus*. This would increase the number of specific names involved by more than 300. The substitution of *Mylabris* for *Bruchus* and of *Bruchus* for *Ptinus*, as proposed about 75 years ago to conform with the law of priority, has not become effective. The above suggestion to invoke the plenary power to suspend the rules and arbitrarily validate *Bruchus* Linnaeus as of 1758 appears to be the only solution. Its effect would be to maintain *Bruchus* and *Ptinus* as they have long been commonly used and to eliminate *Mylabris* from use even for the meloid genus. The older entomologists knew and disregarded the basis of this confusion.

To the pea Bruchus, which we now know to have been introduced into America, other members of the family have since been added so that now nearly 90 species of described bruchids are known to be native to our area or have become established in it by the operations of commerce. Besides these named species about half as many unnamed species have been recognized in collections by L. J. Bottimer or myself. Before undertaking to describe the novelties it has seemed desirable for the writer to distinguish the groups which he has come to recognize during more than 25 years' study of Bruchidae. The present paper is intended to make known the groups of Bruchidae in America, north of Mexico, whether native or introduced, which he believes should be considered genera.

The most recent revision of the Bruchidae of the entire world was published by Schoenherr in 1839, and there has been but little advance in the broader classification of these insects since that time. The arrangement of the species found in the United States and Canada as listed in the Leng Catalogue is based upon the revision of our species by Horn 1873 but *Mylabris*

[1] Received December 11, 1945.

Geoffroy is substituted for *Bruchus* Linnaeus. Twenty-nine valid and available generic names with their genotypes were arranged in five subfamilies by the writer in 1932 (Proc. Ent. Soc. Washington **34**: 100–106). Two additional generic names, *Sulcobruchus* Chujo, 1937, and *Specularius* Bridwell, 1938, have since become available, but these 31 genera are inadequate for the various forms now known in this family. Ten of these named genera occur in our area.

Two of the five subfamilies recognized by the writer in 1932 consist of single genera. The Eubaptinae consist of a single South American species. The Kytorhininae include only the genus *Kytorhinus*. The Pachymerinae were treated by the writer in 1929 (Proc. Ent. Soc. Washington **31**: 141–160) and the genera of Amblycerinae are herein distinguished.

The fifth subfamily, Bruchinae, includes more genera and species than all the others together, but the genera are not easily arranged into groups. *Bruchus* in the Old World and *Megacerus* in America are so different from the other genera as to warrant the erection for them of the monobasic tribes Bruchini and Megacerini. The Old World genera, of which *Bruchidius* is the center, seem to be of common descent separately from the American genera centering in *Acanthoscelides*. It seems advisable to assemble *Bruchidius* Schilsky, *Bruchinus* Schilsky, *Callosobruchus* Pic, *Specularius* Bridwell, 1938 (genotype, *Specularius erythrinae* Bridwell, 1938 = *Bruchus impressithorax* Pic, 1932), and *Sulcobruchus* Chujo into a tribe Bruchidiini. *Caryedes* Hummel, *Impressobruchus* Pic, *Pygiopachymerus* Pic, *Falsobruchus* Pic, *Gibbobruchus* Pic, *Phelomerus* Pic, *Cosmobruchus* Bridwell, *Dahlibruchus* Bridwell, and *Rhipibruchus* Bridwell may be included with *Acanthoscelides* in a tribe Acanthoscelidini. It is premature to attempt a diagnosis of Bruchidini or Acanthoscelidini. Both tribes have the prothorax conical or sometimes campanulate. An impressed line parallel to the lateral margin of the pronotum, such as is found in the Pachymerinae, is more often found in the Acanthoscelidini. In the latter the hind femur usually bears an armature of teeth and denticles, and the hind tibia is armed at apex with a mucro and a lateral apical tooth with two to five subdorsal apical denticles. Aedeagal distinctions between these two tribes also exist. Accepting for the present a tribe Acanthoscelidini for the American Bruchinae, with conical pronotum, we find two series extremely unlike if extremes be taken, but the intergradent forms cannot be very easily separated. The key here given is designed to establish new genera and to distinguish all the genera native to or accidentally established in America north of Mexico. All of them are believed to be natural groups.

KEY TO THE GENERA OF BRUCHIDAE IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

1. Dorsum of prothorax without a surrounding impressed marginal line.....2
   Dorsum of prothorax with a surrounding impressed marginal line; hind femur ovate, much broader than the coxa, unicarinate beneath with a subapical great tooth and beyond it a crista bearing about 10 denticles (Pachymerinae)..... *Caryobruchus* Bridwell, 1929, *C. gleditsiae* (Linnaeus, 1763)
2. Hind tibia with two movable spurs or calcaria; hind coxa twice as broad as the femur (Amblycerinae).....3
   Hind tibia with fixed spines or teeth at apex or unarmed; hind coxa not twice as broad as the femur.....4
3. Eyes very feebly emarginate, elytra elongate, tenth stria reaching nearly to apex; prosternal process separating the coxae to apex; calcaria unequal, the longer more than half as long as first tarsal joint..... .....*Amblycerus* Thunberg, 1815
   Eyes strongly emarginate, elytra subquadrate; tenth stria abbreviate, only half as long as elytron; front coxae not separated by the prosternal process; calcaria shorter, subequal.....*Zabrotes* Horn, 1885
4. Only the pygidium fully sclerotized and exposed behind the elytra; mesepimeron strongly narrowed basally not reaching the coxal cavity (Bruchinae).....5
   Pygidium and preceding tergite fully sclerotized and exposed behind the elytra; mesepimeron not strongly narrowed basally reaching the coxal cavity; antennae serrate in female, flabellate in male (Kytorhininae); Alaska, Alberta. *Kytorhinus* Fischer von Waldheim, 1809, *K. prolixus* (Fall, 1926).
5. Prothorax without a median tooth on lateral margin, front carinate or with a glabrous line or area; male without specialized spine, teeth or lamella at apex of middle tibia..6

Prothorax emarginate on the lateral margin with a single tooth near middle before the emargination; front without a carina or glabrous line; male with specialized spines or processes at apex of middle tibia; hind femur with outer lower margin more prominent armed near apex with a strong acute tooth..... *Bruchus* Linnaeus, 1767 (1758?) (Schilsky restr.)

6. Tenth stria of elytron not abbreviated; antennae never flabellate.....7
   Tenth stria not extending beyond the epipleural lobe; front carinate; antennae serrate in females, flabellate in males; pronotum conical with sides straight or concave, flanks separated from dorsum by a carina and impressed line; elytra depressed along the suture, the intervals of varying width, striae 4 and 5 abbreviated at apex, hind femur but little incrassate, ventral margin flattened with both edges carinate, inner carina simple or with a small obtuse subapical tooth or crenate or serrulate for its entire length; pygidium flat, elongate, vertical (Megacerini)..... .....*Megacerus* Fahraeus, 1839
7. Hind femur not dentate on both inner and outer edges beneath near apex, if emarginate and subdentate on outer edge then dorsum and flank of prothorax separated by a distinct arcuate lateral carina (Acanthoscelidini and *Sparteus*, Bruchidiini)..8
   Hind femur with outer and inner edges armed near apex beneath with a single strong tooth continued toward base by longitudinal carinae; pronotum conical with convex sides, lateral carina obsolete; pygidium vertical or subvertical; antennae unlike in the sexes, subserrate in females, somewhat longer in males, or strongly serrate, or subpectinate. (Bruchidiini)..... .....*Callosobruchus* Pic, 1902
8. Antennae not extraordinarily long.....9
   Antennae of male longer than the body, reaching beyond the hind coxa in female; striae 2–4 arising from a bituberculate elevation at base of elytra; hind femur not as broad as coxa, armed beneath near apex with three similar denticles; hind tibia armed with a long slender mucro half as long as the tibia; pygidium elongate, oblique in female, more convex and vertical in male; hind femur not reaching apex of abdomen in female, extending beyond it in male....*Stylantheus*, n. gen.; genotype *S. macrocerus* (Horn) (*Bruchus macrocerus* Horn, 1873)
9. Hind femur with a strong tooth or spine near apex, beneath, within, and beyond this one or more denticles.....10
   Hind femur unarmed or with a single tooth or spine without denticles.....15
10. Hind femur strongly incrassate, broader than its coxa, channeled beneath, outer edge of ventral margin crenate or serrulate; pygidium of female with a rounded mirror-like area..... *Gibbobruchus* Pic, 1913, *G. mimus* (Say, 1831)
    Hind femur with the outer ventral margin not crenate or serrulate.....11
11. Fourth stria of elytron abbreviate at base starting from a small tubercle; hind femur with inner edge beneath serrulate with a strong tooth beyond the serrulations and after a space with about four denticles.. *Meibomeus* n. gen.; genotype *M. musculus* (Say) (*Bruchus musculus* Say, 1831)
    Fourth stria not abbreviate at base; femoral denticles approximate to the tooth.....12
12. Hind femur broader than the coxa, subsulcate beneath armed beneath within near apex with a strong tooth and 3 or 4 denticles; scutellum transverse; some of the striae arising from basal dentiform elevations; last sternite emarginate in both sexes.... *Merobruchus*, n. gen.; genotype *M. julianus* (Horn) (*Bruchus julianus* Horn, 1894)
    Hind femur not broader than coxa, only 1 or 2 denticles, or if more than 2 denticles the elytron without basal dentiform elevations 13
13. Abdomen elongate, the femur not reaching apex of abdomen; pygidium subhorizontal, elongate, bent down at apex in male; elytra with basal dentiform elevations..14
    Abdomen less elongate, oblique or subvertical ..... *Acanthoscelides* Schilsky, 1905
14. Scutellum transverse; mucro short; front with glabrous area expanded toward vertex; hind femur profoundly channeled beneath in male..*Mimosestes*, n. gen.; genotype *M. sallaei* (Sharp) (*Bruchus sallaei* Sharp, 1885)
    Scutellum twice as long as broad; mucro elongate, frontal glabrous line not expanded toward vertex; hind femur alike in the sexes not profoundly channeled beneath.. *Algarobius*, n. gen.; genotype *A. prosopis* (LeConte)[2] (*Bruchus prosopis* LeConte, 1858)
15. Sides of pronotum convex, surface of dorsum even; depth of body less than width....16
    Sides of pronotum concave, dorsum uneven; front strongly carinate; depth of body about as great as width; elytral striae 5 and 6 abbreviated at apex; pygidium elongate, convex, oblique..*Neltumius*, n. gen.; genotype *N. arizonensis* (Schaeffer) (*Bruchus arizonensis* Schaeffer, 1904)
16. Pronotum with flanks separated from dorsum by a lateral carina ending near coxal cavity.....17

[2] This species includes also *Bruchus uniformis* and *desertorum* LeConte 1858.

Pronotum with flanks not separated by a carina, the lateral carina vestigial or wanting.....18

17. Lateral carina of pronotum simple, in an even curve, not denticulate; pygidium unlike in the sexes; hind femur alike in the sexes, flattened beneath, both edges carinate, the outer more prominent, emarginate before the apical lamella, the inner with a strong suberect tooth near apex; front with a glabrous line not expanded above, or subcarinate; antennae alike in the sexes, not serrate; hind tibia with mucro much longer than lateral apical tooth..... *Stator*, n. gen.; genotype *S. pruininus* (Horn) (*Bruchus pruininus* Horn, 1873)

Lateral carina abruptly bent downward to the coxa with a few denticulations before the middle; pygidium alike in the sexes; hind femur with inner edge carinate, emarginate near apex and produced into a broad flat tooth before the emargination, with a deep pubescent sulcus at base in male; front with a glabrous area expanded above to vertex; antennae serrate, larger in male; hind tibia with lateral apical tooth longer than the mucro..*Cercidiestes*, n. gen.; genotype *C. ulkei* (Horn) (*Bruchus ulkei* Horn, 1873)

18. Hind femur beneath near apex with a distinct tooth or spine.....19

Hind femur unarmed beneath or at most with a minute denticle.....20

19. Hind femur beneath not at all carinate on either margin, inner margin with a strong obliquely truncate spine often tridenticulate on the truncation..*Althaeus*, n. gen.; genotype *A. hibisci* (Olivier) (*Bruchus hibisci* Olivier, 1795)

Hind femur beneath with inner margin carinate, the carina extending nearly to base, microserrulate before the simple spine *Sennius*, n. gen.; genotype *S. cruentatus* (Horn) (*Bruchus cruentatus* Horn, 1873)

20. Elytra with striae 4 and 5 abbreviate at apex; inner margin of hind femur beneath carinate with an apical emargination and a minute denticle or angulation before it... *Sparteus*, n. gen.; genotype *S. villosus* (Fabricius) (*Bruchus villosus* Fabricius, 1792)

Elytra with striae 5 and 6 abbreviate at apex, hind femora entirely without carinae or denticles beneath..*Abutiloneus idoneus*, n. gen. and new sp. (*Bruchus flavicornis* Schaeffer, 1907, and perhaps Sharp, 1885; not *Bruchus flavicornis* Fabricius, 1792)

Abutiloneus idoneus is a small species 1.6 to 1.8 mm long by 1.0 to 1.1 mm wide, densely clothed with pale yellowish to silvery pubescence almost concealing the black integument, the antennae and legs uniformly clear lemon-yellow. Several lots of specimens with the following data have been examined: San Diego, Tex., E. A. Schwarz, May 4–7, probably 1879, 9 specimens; Corpus Christi, Tex., F. C. Pratt, April 12, 1906, one specimen; Brownsville, Tex., L. J. Bottimer, one specimen extracted from a seed of *Abutilon berlandieri* collected by H. C. Hanson, probably in 1919; Brownsville, Tex., reared by the writer in 1921 from Abutilon, 37 specimens: Guerrero, Coahuila, L. J. Bottimer, December 30, 1924, to February 15, 1925, reared from seeds to *Abutilon berlandieri*, collected December 9, 1924, 19 specimens; Brownsville, Tex., Bibby and Higdon, December 12, 1939, from *Abutilon berlandieri*, 6 specimens; Brownsville, Tex., I. Shiller, April 1941, with seeds of *Abutilon lignosum*, 33 specimens; Reynosa, Mexico, through A. J. Chapman, April 3–11, 1941, *Abutilon lignosum*, 12 specimens.

Type locality.—Brownsville, Tex.

Type and 97 paratypes.—U.S.N.M. no. 57766. Twenty paratypes in collection of L. J. Bottimer.

Excluded Genera

North American Bruchidae have been placed in 19 genera; 10 of these genonyms are believed not applicable to any of our species, for reasons indicated with each name.

(1) *Curculio* Linnaeus, 1758, genotype *B. nucum* Linnaeus, designated by Latreille, 1810. Type genus of Curculionidae.

(2) *Dermestes* Linnaeus, 1758, genotype *D. lardarius* Linnaeus, designated by Latreille, 1810. Type genus of Dermestidae.

(3) *Mylabris* Geoffroy, 1762, genotype *Bruchus pisi* Linnaeus, 1767, designated by Bridwell, 1932. I have considered this a synonym of *Bruchus* Linnaeus, 1758. See introductory discussion of *Bruchus*.

(4) *Laria* Scopoli, 1763, genotype *Laria dulcamarae* Scopoli, designated by Bridwell, 1932, accepted by Barber, 1942 (U. S. Dept. Agr. Misc. Bull. 468, p. 9) (*Pria* Stephens, 1829, genotype *Pria truncatella* Marsham, 1802, monobasic. Isogenotypic with *Laria* by synonomy, *Laria dulcamarae* = *Pria truncatella*). This species also appears to be the unnamed type

upon which *Byturus* Latreille, 1796, was erected, but not one of the forms to which the name is now attached. Hence *Laria* is a genus of Nitidulidae.

(5) *Pachymerus* Thunberg, 1805, genotype *Pachymerus bactris* = *Dermestes bactris* Linnaeus, 1763, monobasic.

(6) *Caryoborus* Schoenherr, 1833, genotype *Bruchus* (*Caryoborus*) *serripes* = *Bruchus serripes* Sturm, 1826, by original designation. This and the preceding are distinct tropical American genera without species in our area. *Dermestes gleditsiae* Linnaeus, 1763 = *Bruchus arthriticus* Fabricius, 1801, referred to *Caryoborus* by Schoenherr, 1833 and to *Pachymerus* by Pic, 1913, is the genotype of *Caryobruchus* Bridwell, 1929. *Caryedon fuscus*, of which *Caryoborus gonagra* (Fabricius) is a synonym, is a polyphagous species widely distributed in the Old World tropics. In West Africa a species of *Caryedon* is reported under other names as seriously injurious to the peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) but is in all probability this species. *Caryedon fuscus* has in late years become established in Jamaica, Hispaniola, and Dutch Guiana and may be expected to become established in the United States.

(7) *Pseudopachymerus* Pic, 1913, genotype *Pseudopachymerus brasiliensis* (Thunberg) = *Bruchus brasiliensis* Thunberg, 1816. Failing to trace *Pachymerus* to its source and to find its true genotype, Schoenherr, 1833, designated *Bruchus brasiliensis* Thunberg, 1816, as genotype of *Pachymerus*. This species is congeneric with *Bruchus faldermanni* Mannerheim, 1827, genotype of *Caryedes* Hummel, 1827, a tropical American genus without species in our area. *Pedapholus* Gistl, 1848, Naturg. Thierreichs X (new synonymy), *Adromisus* De Gozis, 1881, and *Pseudopachymerus* Pic, 1913, substitute names for *Pachymerus* Schoenherr not Thunberg having *Bruchus brasiliensis* Thunberg for genotype are synonyms of *Caryedes*. *Bruchus* (*Pachymerus*) *crataegi* Fahraeus, 1839, is a synonym of *Bruchus mimus* Say, which has now been referred to *Gibbobruchus* Pic, 1913. Sharp, 1885, Schilsky, 1905, and others have extended Schoenherr's misapplication of *Pachymerus* to include some species of *Callosobruchus* Pic. These have only a slight resemblance in body form of Schoenherr's pseudotype and have only family characters in common with the true *Pachymerus* as typified by *bactris*.

(8) *Spermophagus* Schoenherr, 1833, genotype *Spermophagus titivilitius* Boheman, 1833, by original designation. The species originally included in *Spermophagus* are referable to three well defined genera; *Amblycerus* Thunberg, 1815, *Spermophagus* restricted, and *Zabrotes* Horn, 1885. Zacher, 1930, divided the genus into three genera, *Spermophagus*, *Zabrotes*, and *Euspermophagus*, the last proposed as new. The group to which he misapplied the name *Spermophagus* is *Amblycerus*, genotype *Bruchus robiniae* Fabricius, 1781. The type of *Spermophagus*, *S. titivilitius*, is, from the description, not congeneric with *robiniae* but with the genotype of *Euspermophagus*, which must therefore be suppressed as a synonym of *Spermophagus* if my conclusions are correct. *Spermophagus titivilitius* was described as from Mexico but the available evidence leads me to believe this an error and that the species is native to the Old World. The same conclusion has been reached for *S. rufiventris* Boheman described at the same time from the Crimea and from Brazil and compared with *titivilitius*. Both species were described as having the abdomen red which is common in *Spermophagus* while in *Zabrotes* the abdomen is always black. Hence *Spermophagus* appears to be the proper name for all Old World Amblycerinae excepting, perhaps, *Pygospermophagus brevicornis* Pic, 1917. This name is based upon a single male which may be a *Spermophagus* with exaggerated secondary sexual characters; the female, when discovered, may be a normal *Spermophagus*. *Spermophagus* has not been described sufficiently to distinguish it from *Zabrotes* which it resembles in its short, compact form, with the pygidium and last visible sternite unlike in the sexes and with the lateral carina of the pronotum complete; in both genera the eyes are deeply emarginate, the ventral surface of the hind tibia is

flattened and definitely limited outwardly by a carina or a row of bristles; the scutellum is a small simple triangle; the short elytra barely cover the base of the pygidium; the calcaria of the hind tibia are short and subequal. From *Zabrotes*, *Spermophagus* differs in these four ways:

A. The tenth elytral stria is complete reaching both base and apex while in *Zabrotes* this stria is abbreviate at apex, not extending beyond the middle of the elytron.

B. In *Spermophagus* the flanks of the pronotum below the lateral carina are produced anteriorly into a vertical carina which hides the hind margin of the eye in repose; this structure is not present in *Zabrotes*.

C. In *Spermophagus* the intercoxal process of the prosternum, when seen from in front, is acuminate reaching nearly or quite to the apex of the coxa and has a vertical posterior face between the coxae reaching from their apices to the connecting membrane; this process in *Zabrotes*, when seen from in front, is a short triangle separating the coxae for only half of their length without a posterior vertical face.

D. The outer apical lamella of the hind femur is elevated, its apical angle rounded in *Spermophagus* while in *Zabrotes* this angle is acute. The great majority of species of *Spermophagus* are attached to species of Convolvulaceae, a few to Malvaceae (*Hibiscus* and *Urena*), host plants not known to be affected by *Amblycerus* or *Zabrotes*. One African species affects a species of Cassia. Species of *Spermophagus* are found in England, in Sweden and eastward to Japan, south to New Caledonia, Australia, (*Bruchus perpastus* Lea, 1899, from Western Australia being a species of *Spermophagus*) and the Cape of Good Hope, but are in complete confusion, so that application of names is impossible without study of types. No species referable to *Spermophagus* as here restricted has been seen from any American locality.

(9) *Bruchidius* Schilsky, 1905, as originally described is too polymorphic to remain undivided. *Bruchidius quinqueguttatus* (Olivier, 1795) is the designated genotype, Bridwell, 1932. No American bruchid seems congeneric with this species. *Bruchus villosus* Fabricius, 1792, has become established in Massachusetts and in Virginia. It was included by Shilsky in *Bruchidius* under the untenable name *Bruchidius cisti* (Paykull) and is the genotype of a new genus, *Sparteus*, above described.

(10) *Pachybruchus* Pic, 1912. The genotype, *Bruchus coryphae* Olivier, 1795, designated by Bridwell, 1932, is congeneric with the genotype of *Megacerus* Fahraeus, 1833.

ZOOLOGY.—*A new sea anemone from Woods Hole, Massachusetts.*[1]

SEARS CROWELL, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, and Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, Mass. (Communicated by WALDO L. SCHMITT.)

In 1939, Dr. William J. Bowen brought to me specimens of a small sea anemone taken from the Mill Pond, at Woods Hole. This anemone is noteworthy in several respects: (1) It belongs to a genus hitherto represented by only one species, and that from only one locality, the Isle of Wight in the English Channel. (2) It has evaded observation until recently, even though it is abundant at a location almost in the shadow of the Marine Biological Laboratory. (3) It possesses nematosomes. These are small clusters of cells that bear nematocysts and that move around freely in the coelenteron without permanent attachment to the body of the anemone. These nematosomes are being studied further, since no knowledge of their function or origin exists. (4) It is well suited for study by students in general or invertebrate zoology, in that it is small, transparent, simple in structure, hardy, and available at almost all seasons. It has been used by the classes at the Marine Biological Laboratory and successfully shipped as far as Ohio, where it arrived in good condition.

[1] Received December 20, 1945.

Genus **Nematostella** Stephenson, 1935

The genus *Nematostella* was established by Stephenson to include those Edwardsidae that could not be referred to *Edwardsia* because of the absence of nemathybomes and that could not be referred to *Milne-Edwardsia* because the outer tentacles are longer than the inner. From both of these genera it differs in the possession of nematosomes. The type species is *Nematostella vectensis* Stephenson, 1935.